

REMARKS

The present application includes claims 1-3, 7-8, 11-13 and 25. Claim 24 was cancelled. Claim 26 is new and finds support in paragraphs [0035] and [0049] of the application as filed.

Summary of rejections

Claims 1, 3, 11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marui (US patent 5,471,643) in view of Van Reenen (US patent publication 2005/0107102).

Claims 2 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marui (US patent 5,471,643) in view of Van Reenen (US patent publication 2005/0107102) and Okkonen (US patent publication 2004/0166839).

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marui (US patent 5,471,643) in view of Van Reenen (US patent publication 2005/0107102), Childs (US patent publication 2002/0107868) and Staas (US patent 5,125,091).

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marui (US patent 5,471,643) in view of Van Reenen (US patent publication 2005/0107102), Childs (US patent publication 2002/0107868), Staas (US patent 5,125,091) and Bartels (US patent publication 2003/0208704).

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marui (US patent 5,471,643) in view of Van Reenen (US patent publication 2005/0107102), Childs (US patent publication 2002/0107868), Staas (US patent 5,125,091), Bartels (US patent publication 2003/0208704) and Roberts (US patent publication 2005/0073991).

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marui (US patent 5,471,643) in view of Van Reenen (US patent publication 2005/0107102) and Binders (US patent 6,513,052).

Independent claims 1 and 11

Regarding claims 1 and 11, applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 requires:

“determining whether a user has modified configuration data stored in a memory of a mobile device ...”; and

“transmitting the configuration data to a server system for updating respective records of a database in the mobile communication network...”

“wherein the configuration data comprises at least one of an access point name (APN), a web gateway internet protocol (IP) address, a short messaging service center (SMSC), system identification code (SID) and communication environment dependent information.”

The Examiner has cited Marui as describing a user modifying configuration data and Van Reenen as determining when a user has modified data and transmitting the modified data to a server. The Examiner stated that it would be obvious to modify Mauri to include transmitting data that has been modified by a user to a server system for storing and updating ... since such a modification would allow the mobile device to store a copy of its stored data remotely in order to facilitate restoring the memory of the mobile device in case of damage, theft or displacement.

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

It is noted that the Examiner stated, on page 3, line 16 of the office action, that Van Reenen relates to “configuration data”, but applicant could not find the word “configuration” in an electronic search through Van Reenen and could not find the term configuration or any equivalent term in any of the passages related to by the Examiner (abstract, paragraphs 2-10, 21). Applicant respectfully submits that Van Reenen teaches the complete opposite. In paragraph [0020] Van Reenen states:

“Data that is backed up may be the names and telephone numbers stored in the telephone device, calendar data, addresses, files, notes, tasks, graphics, and the like.”

This is totally different from configuration data.

Thus, neither of Marui or Van Reenen teach or suggest identifying changes in configuration data and backup the configuration data at a server. It would not be obvious to modify the cited art to encompass backup of configuration data. The rationale provided by the Examiner is that the backup suggested by Van Reenen would facilitate restoring the memory of the mobile device in case of damage, theft or displacement. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that if the mobile device is damaged, stolen or displaced the configuration data of the mobile device (referring specifically to the classes of parameters mentioned in claim 1)

would not usually be needed by the user as the user would generally get a new mobile device which would be configured with its configuration parameters.

Applicant respectfully submits that Van Reenen does not seem to add anything more than described in the provisional of Roth, discussed in applicants previous response. Roth, Van Reenen and Childs describe acts similar to the determining and transmitting of claim 1 for customization parameters and for reliability and maintenance data of manufacturing and power plants, but none of the art of record, to applicants best knowledge, suggests performing these acts on the configuration data mentioned in claim 1.

The reasons provided by Roth, Van Reenen and Childs for performing these similar acts do not apply to the specific configuration data listed in claim 1 and therefore there is no teaching in the art to modify Roth, Van Reenen and/or Childs to relate to such configuration data.

Claim 11 is an apparatus claim with limitations similar to those of claim 1 and is therefore patentable for similar reasons.

The dependent claims are patentable at least because they depend on patentable claims.

New claim 26 claims the acts of the support center in accessing the stored configuration data. The method of claim 26 is different from the art in which the stored data is used for backup.

Attorney Docket No: 0276-074
Attorney Customer No: 74917
Serial Number: 10/706,173


PATENT

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the above amendments and arguments the claims are allowable. Allowance of the application is respectfully awaited. If, however, the Examiner does not see fit to allow the claims, applicants respectfully request following the provisions of MPEP 713.01 that the Examiner notify applicant's agent after he has considered the effect of the applicant's current response so that a telephone interview between the Examiner and applicant's agent can be arranged before a further action is issued. Applicant is of the opinion that such a telephone interview can expedite the case to final action.

Applicant's agent can be reached by calling patent attorney, Robert Lev, at (330) 759-1423 or sending an email to applicant's agent (yschatz@israel-patents.co.il).

Respectfully Submitted,
Lev Intellectual Property Consulting



Robert G. Lev
Registration No: 30,280

Date: July 08, 2010

4766 Michigan Blvd.
Youngstown, OH 44505
330-759-1423 telephone
330-759-4865 fax
patdoc@lev-ip.com

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
DEPOSITED WITH THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE AS
EXPRESS MAIL IN AN ENVELOPE ADDRESSED TO:
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS, PO BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA,
VA 22313-1450, ON 07-08-2010

LABEL NO. EH 797542241US
NAME Kim Woods
SIGNATURE Kim Woods